



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

rate legal and religious systems there had to be built a single state, even while the distinctiveness of the two nationalities was to be preserved. The effort was successful; and it is for the most part an explanation of that success that the authors essay. They give us what is by far the most succinct account of the main features of Scottish parliamentary government before 1707. Mainly it is a government elected by the Lowland freeholders and with a relation to the administrative process that is entirely singular in English history. What rendered legislative union essential was the Revolution of 1688. Though the Scottish Parliament never became the focal point of national life — that honor was reserved for the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church — it did, after 1688, receive an immense impetus of power. Union was necessary, from the English standpoint, for the sake of uniformity, and to avoid the difficulties the Hanoverian succession would inevitably have raised. To Scotland it was essential in the interest of commercial prosperity. The antagonism to the union was intense; and it is of interest that its root should have been a revival of Scotch nationalism. What secured the triumph was the superb statesmanship of those who drafted the measure. In law and in religion they gave the Scottish Parliament all the guarantees that pride and self-interest might desire, at the same time that they gave Englishmen certain special advantages they had long desired. The act is a revolutionary document. It created a single state from two kingdoms. It placed the government of Scotland under the power of a predominant and sovereign partner. Nor did the act work well at the outset. From 1707 until 1760 it made its way to popularity only with grave difficulty. There was political unity without moral agreement. It was not until the next half-century that the spiritual union of the two civilizations was secured.

The authors rightly point out that the act of union has had a success without adequate historical parallel. It preserved intact the essence of Scottish nationality, while it gave to Scotland the superior benefits of English administration. What will occur to the reader is the different history of the Irish Union. The authors do not mention it, though doubtless it is in their mind. If it is their inference that what has been true of Scotland could be made true of Ireland, the answer surely is that not even the period (1886-1905) of economic conciliation had any sensible influence. They might argue that the statesmanship of 1707 was absent in 1800; that Ireland should have been given the safeguards upon which Scottish wisdom insisted. But the answer surely is that the only alternative to accepting the Scottish terms was conquest, while Ireland was already conquered. Legislative union is a specific for equals. It does not efface the tragic blunders of seven hundred years.

HAROLD J. LASKI.

JOHN ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT 1853-1861. By Henry G. Connor, LL.D., Judge of the United States Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1920. pp. 310.

This is a sober, careful biography of a judge of the Supreme Court perhaps best known to-day as a concurren in the opinion of the Chief Justice in the *Dred Scott* case. But in the life of Judge Campbell was far more of the quality of drama than is to be found in the lives of most of his fellow justices, even in that troubled time — a quality, one imagines, alien alike to his wish and his temperament.

He was born in Georgia, but practiced law in Alabama, from which state he was called to the Supreme Court at the age of forty-one. To that bench he brought great learning and industry; in his opinions, his conception of the relative positions of state and federal governments is plainly discernible, but

his ideas of constitutional law were philosophic rather than partisan, and, when Lincoln was elected, he opposed the secession of his state with all his force. To prevent the breach, he acted as a negotiator between Seward and the commissioners of the Provisional Government which had been set up by the seceding states, services which proved not only unavailing but, in a personal sense at least, disastrous, for he was blamed by a large part of contemporary opinion and by later historians for the misapprehension of the South as to the alleged promise to evacuate Fort Sumter. To prove that Judge Campbell was not only innocent of any deception but was himself deceived is one of the purposes of his biographer, and Judge Campbell's own account of the negotiations certainly tends to prove the strictures of Nicolay and Hay to be undeserved. Whatever may be the final word as to that controversy, when he saw the crisis could not be averted, Judge Campbell, like so many of his fellow Southerners who had desired to maintain the Union, felt it his duty to follow his state, and accordingly resigned his position as United States Justice, taking later in its place the position of Confederate Assistant Secretary of War. Just before the end of the war he acted again as mediator, being one of the commissioners who met Lincoln in the Hampton Roads Conference. After the war and a short imprisonment, he resumed his law practice in New Orleans, and appeared often before the court in which he had sat. He was of counsel in the Slaughter-House Cases, and that he argued so vigorously against the constitutionality of the Louisiana statute was not due to the accident of a retainer fee, but to his whole-hearted readiness to support what he believed to be the new theory of our government.

Judge Connor narrates this full life with discernment and with appreciation. His discussion of the important cases in which Judge Campbell gave opinions or argued gives an excellent indication of the development of our constitutional law during the period of which he writes. A good part of the book is devoted to Judge Campbell's part in Secession and Restoration. It is perhaps a sorry solace for the disappointments of the unsuccessful statesmen of moderation to reflect that some biographer will adequately demonstrate their farsightedness to a more appreciative generation, but Judge Campbell, if he entertained that thought, was fully justified. Not, indeed, that he needed solace for his own fate; he lived and died greatly respected by his community and his profession. His personality does not seem to have been one to have commanded a warmer affection, save from his intimates. He was reserved, almost austere; tall, thin, with a stern face, remarkable for its keen eyes and formidable brows. If he did not achieve the effect of the walking cathedral to which Webster was compared, at least people were awed by his presence. But he was kind and just, and even his austerity seems to have been only a defense against encroachments upon his legal meditations. His dignity was not so great but that he could cogitate while sitting upon a covered hydrant on the pavement, munching an apple, nor his reserve so unalterable but that he could take the arm of the young law clerk who came upon him in that posture and expound a point of law to him as profoundly as though the young man were a learned court. Nor does his preoccupation, no matter how intense, seem ever to have marred his courtesy.

BOOKS RECEIVED

BRITISH LABOR CONDITIONS AND LEGISLATION DURING THE WAR. By M. B. Hammond. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. New York: Oxford University Press.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS. By Sir Frederick Pollock, Bt. New York: The Macmillan Company.